UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/665,598	09/22/2003	Fumio Kubo	1131-0488P	6369	
	7590 05/21/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 747		CORDRAY, DENNIS R			
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		, 1731			
			[		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/21/2007	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	V
10/665,598	KUBO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dennis Cordray	1731	

	Dennis Cordray	1731					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final reject	on.				
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
	diance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ne of the date of				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ne appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in belappeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	-				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9.		II be entered and an o	explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nt before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.  10. The first in the state of	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	in of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	nea.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments present new issues that require further searching or consideration, as follows:

- 1. a separation passage defined by front and rear walls apart from each other in a direction along said feed passage and by opposite side walls apart from each others in a direction across said feed passage and defining a width of said separation passage, and
  - 2. specific orientation of the optical detection axis.

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding Applicants arguments pertaining to the placement of optical sensors in the apparatus of Brand et al or Kazuichi et al, the problem of stagnation of tobacco shreds in widthwise opposite regions of the separation passage is admitted in the instant Specification to be known in prior art (p 2, lines 6-32). Using optical sensors to detect stagnation and/or control flow of tobacco shreds in passages is also known from the cited prior art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of determining the proper location of sensors in the front, back or side walls of the separation passage of a shredded tobacco feeding machine to most efficiently detect stagnation of the tobacco in the passage.

Note: the amendment filed indicated thereon that it is dated May 3, 2007 with a signature date of May 3, 2007, but it has a USPTO mailroom date of May 2, 2007.

STEVEN P. GRIFFIN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700